

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

John Henry Locklear,)	C/A No. 5:14-cv-02166-TMC-KDW
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Mr. Bryan Stirling; Willie E. Eagleton;)	
Roland McFadden; Ms. Annie Sellers; Dr.)	
Samuel Soltis; Dr. John McRee; Michael)	
McCall; Robert E. Ward; Al Smith; Ms.)	
Fox; Doris Jacques; David Tatarsky; Maria)	
Leggins; Janice Phillips; Officer Miles;)	
Nurse Stoke; Ms. Hunter; Dr. Hughes; Ms.)	
Jeffcoat; and Christina Kellett,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 7, 2015, Defendants Fox, Hughes, Hunter, Jacques, McRee, Smith, Soltis, and Stokes filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 91. Defendants Sellers, Stirling, Kellett, Tartarsky, Phillips, Leggins, McCall, Jeffcoat, Miles, Ward, McFadden, and Eagleton filed a separate Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 92. Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of such motions and of the need for him to file adequate responses. ECF No. 93. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendants' Motions may be granted, thereby ending this case. Thereafter, the court granted Plaintiff's Motion for an extension of time to file a Response, ECF No. 96, making the Response to the first Motion for Summary Judgment due on or before June 8,

2015. ECF No. 97. Though the order indicates that Plaintiff's response deadline is extended until June 8, 2015 for ECF No. 91 only, Plaintiff's deadline for both Summary Judgment Motions, including ECF No. 92, was extended until June 8, 2015.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order and though Plaintiff was granted additional time to respond, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Motions. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the Motions and wishes to abandon this action against Defendants. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment, ECF Nos. 91, 92, by **July 16, 2015**. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 16, 2015
Florence, South Carolina

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kaymani D. West". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kaymani" being more prominent than the last name "West".

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge